

REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 7-13, and 15-17 are all the claims pending in this application. Claim 17 has been added herein. This Response, submitted in reply to the Office Action dated February 6, 2008, is believed to be fully responsive to each point of rejection raised therein. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration on the merits is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections -35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1, 4, 9, 12, and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Yamamoto (US 5,048,223; henceforth “Yamamoto ‘223”) in view of Wallace (US 3,778,916) and Werner (US 6,620,286)². Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

In rejecting claim 1, the Examiner asserts (with reference to Fig. 2) that Yamamoto ‘223 discloses a fishing rod comprising a rod pipe that is inserted into a tubular body 12, and a body (material between 12a and 12e) that is integrally molded with the tubular body 12. Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has clearly misconstrued Yamamoto ‘223.

Yamamoto ‘223 has been the basis for rejecting these claims in previous Office Actions. Previously, the Examiner asserted that element 13 of Yamamoto ‘223 was equivalent to the body integrally molded to the tubular body. In response, Applicant successfully argued that element 13 of Yamamoto ‘223 failed to teach the body being integrally formed with the tube body. Now, the Examiner asserts that the material between elements 12a and 12e teaches the body integrally molded to the tubular body.

² Applicant notes that the Office Action indicates claim 1-4 are rejected; However, in the Office Action, the Examiner Acknowledges that this combination of references does not teach the features of claims 2 and 3 and provides an additional reference discussed below. Therefore, Applicant asserts that by the Examiner’s own admission, claims 2 and 3 are patentable over the above combination of references.

However, 12a is a cavity formed in the reel mounting member 12 and 12e is a recess formed in the reel mounting member 12. *See* Col. 4, lines 18-32. The material between this cavity 12a and this recess 12e is clearly part of the reel mounting member 12, which the Examiner also asserts teaches the tubular body of claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits that the same element cannot be asserted to teach both the tubular body and the body integrally molded with the tubular body recited in claim 1, because these are two discrete elements which are integrally molded together and not portions of a single element.

Further, in rejecting claim 1, the Examiner acknowledges that Yamamoto '223 fails to teach a "concealing film" as recited. Instead, the Examiner relies on Werner for the feature of a "concealing film." However, Applicant respectfully submits that Werner does not disclose a concealing film.

Werner merely discloses a carrier 28 having first and second sides 30, 32 with each side having adhesive 12 thereon. The carrier 28 can be made of various materials including paper, tissue and the like, and in the shown embodiment, is made of a polymeric film. Applicant respectfully submits that in order to be a "concealing film", the carrier should at least not be transparent. However, Werner does not teach or disclose whether or not the polymeric film is transparent, and indeed, the polymeric film of Werner can be transparent.

Further, Werner teaches both sides of the carrier having adhesive and Applicant respectfully submits that because the two opposite sides of the carrier have adhesive, the carrier is incapable of concealing adhesive on at least one side. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Werner does not teach a concealing film as recited in claim 1 and actually teaches away from the invention as claimed in claim 1.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 and all claims dependant thereon are patentable over the applied references. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

Claim 9 recites “a reinforced tubular body” and a “...body which is integrally molded with an outer side of the tubular body... and is made of a material softer than that of the tubular body”. As described in the specification, the tubular body is formed of a reinforced material while the body integrally molded with tubular body is formed of a material softer than the tubular body. *See* Paragraph [0057]. The reel mounting member 12 of Yamamoto ‘223, does not teach or suggest a tubular body and a body integrally molded with tubular body having these properties, because the reel mounting member is formed of one material and not two materials integrally molded together. Further, Wallace and Werner also do not teach or suggest these features. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 9 and all claims dependant thereon are patentable over the applied references for at least this reason. Further, claim 9 also recites features similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 1, and Applicant respectfully submits that to the extent that claim 9 recites similar features, claim 9 and all claims dependant thereon are patentable for analogous reasons. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn as well.

Claims 2 and 3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Yamamoto ‘223 in view of Wallace and Yamamoto et al (US 6,105,302; henceforth “Yamamoto’302”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claims 2 and 3 depend from claim amended 1, which has been shown above to be patentable over the combination of Yamamoto ‘223 and Wallace. Yamamoto ‘302 does not cure any of the deficiencies of Yamamoto ‘223 and Wallace discussed above. Therefore, Applicant

respectfully submits that claims 2 and 3 patentable at least by virtue of their dependency and respectfully requests that the rejection of these claims also be withdrawn.

Claims 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Yamamoto et al. (US 6,105,302; henceforth “Yamamoto ‘302”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

In rejecting claim 7, the Examiner asserts that Yamamoto ‘302 teaches a fishing rod comprising a reinforced tubular body and a synthetic resin body which bonded to the outside of the tubular member and which is formed of a material softer than the reinforced tubular body. The Examiner acknowledges that Yamamoto ‘302 fails to teach the tubular body and the synthetic resin body being integrally molded. However, the Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to integrally mold the two bodies, since *Howard v. Detroit Stove Works*, 150 U.S. 164 (1893) holds that forming in one piece an article which has formerly been formed in two pieces and put together involves only routine skill in the art. See page 5 of the Office Action. Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner is clearly misconstrued *Howard*.

Howard v. Detroit Stove Works involved a series of patents relating to stoves. The court held that it was obvious to cast an oven door from a single piece of cast iron when previously multiple pieces of cast iron were bolted or riveted together to form a door. Conversely, claim 7 involves a reinforced tubular body and a synthetic resin body integrally formed with the outer side of the tubular body and made of a material softer than that of the tubular body. Claim 7 involves integrally molding two components from different materials having different hardness values. Applicant respectfully submits that this is very different from casting an oven door as a single piece of cast iron. Applicant further submits that it is not a matter of routine skill to

integrally form a reinforced tubular body and a synthetic resin body as recited in claim 7, and claim 7 is therefore patentable over Yamamoto '302. Further, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 8, 10, 11, 13, and 16 all depend from claim 7 and are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of these claims also be withdrawn.

New Claims

Claim 17 has been added herein, and depends from claim 1, which was shown above to be patentable over the applied references. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 17 is patentable at least by virtue of its dependency and respectfully requests that this claim be allowed.

Conclusion


In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned Attorney at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
Application No.: 10/787,130

Attorney Docket No.: Q80148

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880 via EFS payment screen. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Brian W. Hannon
Registration No. 32,778

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON DC SUGHRUE/265550

65565

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: May 2, 2008